

REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that entry of the foregoing response will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, requests that the above response be, kindly, reconsidered.

The Office Action dated November 16, 2004 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-20 stand rejected by the October 7, 2003 Office Action. Claims 7 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but otherwise stated as being allowable.

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 1-6, 10-14 and 18-20 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over Chapman (IEEE Transaction on Magnetics, V. 25, No. 5, pp. 3686-3688, 1989) (hereinafter referred to as Chapman). The Examiner's position is that a person of ordinary skill within the art would find it obvious to create the invention defined by the rejected claims from the teachings of Chapman. The Applicants, respectfully, disagree with this assertion contained within the Office Action. There is no magnetic coil formed on an edge of a substrate taught or suggested by Chapman. The only coil disclosed within Chapman is illustrated in Figure 7 and is not formed at an edge of any substrate. Therefore, in an effort to move this case towards allowance, independent Claims 1, 5 and 13 have been amended to clearly define the subject matter of the invention wherein the magnetic coil is formed on the top layer, which top layer is exposed by the removal of the first substrate. The Applicants respectfully assert that this amendment removes the claims of the present invention from any reasonable reading of Chapman. There is no disclosure or suggestion within Chapman that would suggest to a person of ordinary skill within the art any advantage to gain from using the layer upon which a magnetic coil is formed as the exposed (air bearing surface) surface after removal of the second substrate. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are allowable over Chapman.

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 8 and 16 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,742 issued to Crue et al. (hereinafter referred to as Crue et al.). The Examiner states that Crue et al. teaches a magnetic head and discloses an alumina layer is a heat sink layer. The Applicants would like to, respectfully point out that Crue et al. provides no disclosure or suggestion for a magnetic coil that is formed on a layer on top of at a first side of a first substrate and removing material from a

second side of the first substrate to expose the top layer upon which the magnetic coil is formed, wherein the second side forms the head face. Rejected Claims 8 and 16 include all the subject matter of the claims from which they depend that have been previously discussed as being allowable. Rejected Claims 8 and 16 further recite that the heat sink is formed next to the magnetic coil during the formation of the magnetic coil. The recited magnetic coil, as previously stated, is formed on a layer at the surface of the first substrate; which layer becomes exposed. Crue et al. clearly illustrate that coil 140 as disclosed therein is not at the surface. Neither Chapman nor Crue et al. disclose the formation of a coil on a layer that becomes exposed as recited by rejected Claims 8 or 16. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully, traversed.

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 9 and 17 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,319 issued to Wang, et al. (hereinafter referred to as Wang et al.). The Examiner states that Chapman describes the claimed method but does not show the structure of the coil and that Wang et al. discloses the structure of the coil. The Applicants, respectfully, disagree with this assertion contained in the Office Action. The teachings of Wang et al. relate to a coil assembly 12 that is mounted onto a slider 14. Rejected Claims 9 and 17 include all the subject matter of the claims from which they depend that have been previously discussed as being allowable. The recited magnetic coil, as previously stated, is formed on a layer at the surface of the first substrate; which layer becomes exposed. The present invention as recited by rejected Claims 9 and 17 recite a slider that is formed with a coil. The Applicants would like to, respectfully point out that Wang et al. is illustrative of the prior art problem that is solved by the present invention (e.g. see page 2, lines 21-25 of the specification to the present invention, wherein the problems associated with forming a "ditch" to place the coil in are discussed). The recited magnetic coil, as previously stated, is formed at the surface of the first substrate. Wang et al. clearly describes the independent formation of a coil to be placed on the slider afterwards and does not pertain to the formation of a slider with the coil formed on the slider. Neither Chapman nor Wang et al. disclose the formation of a coil at the air bearing surface as recited by rejected Claims 9 and 17. Accordingly, this rejection is respectfully, traversed.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
(914) 333-9643,

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:
Mail Stop: Amendment
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: March 15, 2005

(Signature) 

By:

James D. Leimbach